

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS FO Box 1430 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.nepto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.		
10/567,326	02/07/2006	Shoji Sekino	NEC NE70217	6649	
27667 HAYES SOLO	7590 08/11/200 OWAY P.C	EXAMINER			
3450 E. SUNRISE DRIVE, SUITE 140			ENIN-OKUT, EDU E		
TUCSON, AZ 85718			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
			1795	1795	
			NOTIFICATION DATE	DELIVERY MODE	
			08/11/2009	ELECTRONIC .	

## Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

admin@hayes-soloway.com smckniff@hayes-soloway.com nsoloway@hayes-soloway.com

## **Advisory Action** Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

Application No.	Applicant(s)	
10/567,326	SEKINO ET AL.	
Examiner	Art Unit	
Edu E. Enin-Okut	1795	

	Edu E. Enin-Okut	1795			
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ars on the cover sheet with the o	orrespondence add	ress		
THE REPLY FILED 28 July 2009 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPL	ICATION IN CONDITION FOR AL	LOWANCE.			
<ol> <li>X The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on application, applicant must limely file one of the following application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appe for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 C periods:</li> </ol>	eplies: (1) an amendment, affidavi	t, or other evidence, w with 37 CFR 41.31; or	hich places the (3) a Request		
The period for reply expiresmonths from the mailing	date of the final rejection.				
b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection.					
Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (I MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f	).				
Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1,135(a). The date have been filled is the date for purposes of determining the period of exhaunce of the control of the c	ension and the corresponding amount of hortened statutory period for reply origing than three months after the mailing date	of the fee. The appropria nally set in the final Office e of the final rejection, e	ate extension fee e action; or (2) as ven if timely filed,		
<ol> <li>The Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in compl filling the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any exter Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed wi AMENDMENTS</li> </ol>	sion thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to	avoid dismissal of the			
The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, be They raise new issues that would require further cor  They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below	sideration and/or search (see NOT		cause		
(c) ☐ They are not deemed to place the application in bett appeal; and/or		lucing or simplifying t	ne issues for		
(d) ☐ They present additional claims without canceling a c		ected claims.			
NOTE: <u>See Continuation Sheet</u> . (See 37 CFR 1.11					
4. The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.12		mpliant Amendment (I	PTOL-324).		
5. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s):					
<ol> <li>Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be all- non-allowable claim(s).</li> </ol>	owabie ir submitted in a separate, t	imely filed amendmer	it canceling the		
7.  For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) how the new or amended claims would be rejected is proved the status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:		be entered and an e	xplanation of		
Claim(s) allowed: Claim(s) objected to: Claim(s) rejected: <u>1.3.4 and 6-11</u> .					
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: 2 and 5.					
AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE 8. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but	before or on the date of filing a No	tion of Annual will not	he entered		
because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).					
<ol> <li>The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to or showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary</li> </ol>	vercome <u>all</u> rejections under appea and was not earlier presented. Se	l and/or appellant fail ee 37 CFR 41.33(d)(1	s to provide a ).		
10. The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation	n of the status of the claims after er	ntry is below or attach	ed.		
REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER  11. The request for reconsideration has been considered but	does NOT place the application in	condition for allowan	ce because:		
40 THE WALLEY TO BE A SECOND TO SECO	DTO(OD(O) D N. ( )				
<ol> <li>Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s). (</li> <li>Other: See Continuation Sheet.</li> </ol>	P10/56/08) Paper No(s)				

/Dah-Wei D. Yuan/ U.S. Patent and Trademark Office

Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 1795

/Edu E. Enin-Okut/

Examiner, Art Unit 1795

Continuation of 3, NOTE: The amended filed July 28, 2009 does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because:

Claim 7, as amended, would be rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. Claim 7 recites the limitation "said elastic film". There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.

Claim 1, as amended, would be rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Horiba et al. (US 4,493,878) in view of Yonetsu et al. (US 7,147,950). Additional supporting evidence provided by Prasad et al. (US 2006/0256176).

Regarding claim 1 as amended, Horiba teaches a fuel supplier placed in a fuel supply system of a fuel cell (2:30-64; Claim 1), including a fuel vessel (cartridge 2); a permeation control film coupled to the fuel vessel (net-like substrate material (net) 3 provided in a portion of the cartridge 2); and, a supplementary fuel fluel element 1) contained in the fuel vessel (Figs. 1, 2, 2:30-37; Claim 2).

As to the supplementary fuel contained in the fuel vessel being restrictively transmitted through the permeation film to the fuel cell, or allowing the supplementary fuel to move to the fuel supple yestem through the permeation control film, these limitations have considered, and construed as a functional limitation that adds no additional structure to the fuel supple of Fuel fuels used to the fuel supple of fuels used in the fuel supple of functioning as claimed.

Horiba teaches that its permeation control film is composed of polypropylene net (4:1-2). One of ordinary skill would appreciate that polypropylene can swell when exposed to substances such as methanol (see Prasad, para. 14, 16, 17). That artisan would also appreciate that the amount of swelling of the polypropylene is dependant upon how much of that substance it is exposed to (i.e., the concentration of the substance in a solution). Further, the swelling of a polypropylene net like that taught by Horiba will expand the fibers forming the net, changing its shape and reducing the void volume of the net, thus, restricting the amount of fuel (e.g., methanol-containing fuel) flowing through the net.

Therefore, one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention would have found it obvious to use the ability of the polypropylene net of Horbite to respond (i.e., change its shape) to exposure to liquid fuels, such as methanot restrict the amount of fuel supplied by its fuel supplier without adding additional control equipment; thus, achieving a compact fuel cell device (see Horiba, 3:44-46). Horbite does not expressly teach that as whater member is placed on the fuel permeable film.

Yonetsu teaches a fuel cell with fuel tank 1 having a cylindrical lid 31, which can be opened or closed, is slidably mounted around the fuel outlet port 12 of a liquid fuel tank 1, and a permeating material connecting pad 52 is mounted to the inner wall of the pathway 3 (10:38-43; Figs. 9A, 9B). When the liquid fuel tank 1 is connected to a pathway 3, the lid 31 is pushed upward so as to bring the outlet port of the tank into contact with the permeating material connection pad (10:43-47). When the fuel outlet port is brought into contact with the permeating material connection pad, the liquid fuel is transferred from the tank into the pathway by the capillar pad in (10:48-51).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to include a shutter member in the fuel supplier of Horiba, as taught by Yonetsu, in order to further control the flow of fuel from the fuel supplier to a fuel cell (see Yonetsu, 10:43-

As to the shutter member controlling an exposed area of said fuel permeable film; or, that the shutter member slides on the surface of the surface of the film such that the exposed area of the film is controlled, these limitations have been considered, and construed as a functional limitations that add no additional structure to the shutter member. See MPEP 2114. However, because the shutter member of Horiba, as modified by Yonetsu, is structurally similar to that instantiv disclosed, it accears capable of functioning as claimed.

As to applicant's arguments with respect to Yonetsu reference, it should be noted that, during patent examination, the pending claims must be given the broadest reasonable interpretation consistent with the specification. In re Morris, 127-7.8d 1048, 1054, 44
USPO2d 1023, 1027 (Fed. Cir. 1997); In re Prater, 415 F.2d 1393, 162 USPO\_541 (CCPA 1969). See also MPEP 2111 - 2111.01. Limitations from the specification are not read into the claims. In re Van Geuns, 988 F.2d 1181, 26 USPO2d 1057 (Fed. Cir. 1993). In addition, it should be also noted that "[tiple use of patents as references is not limited to what the patentees describe as their own inventions or to the problems with which they are concerned. They are part of the literature of the art, relevant for all they contain." In re Heck, 699
F.2d 1331, 1332-332, 216 USPO 1038, 1039 (Fed. Cir. 1983). A reference may be relied upon for all that it was reasonably suggested to one having ordinary skill the art, including non-preferred embodiments. Merck & Co. v. Biocraft Laboratories, 874 F.2d 804, 10
USPO2d 1845, (Fed. Cir.), cert. denied., 493 U. Upsher-Smith Labs. v. Pamilab, LLC, 412 F.3d 1319, 1323, 75 USPO2d 1213, 1215 (Fed. Cir. 2005) (reference disclosing optional inclusion of a particular component teaches compositions that both do and do not contain that component). See MEPE 2123 (1)

In this case, one would appreciate that a "shutter" is defined as "one that shuts" (see "shutter" on Merriam-Webster's Online Dictionary). Further, as discussed in previous Office Action, Yonetsu teaches a slidably mounted tift that controls the flow of fuel from a fuel tank (see discussion of Yonetsu reference on p. 5 of the Final Office Action issued on May 27, 2009).

Continuation of 13. Other: Attachment - "Shutter" from Merriam-Webster's Online Dictionary.